



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,059	12/02/2005	Wolfgang Otto Budde	DE03 0020 US	8936

24738 7590 11/05/2009  
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
PO BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001

EXAMINER
----------

BENOIT, ESTHER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2442

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/05/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/542,059	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUDDE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ESTHER BENOIT	<b>Art Unit</b> 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendments***

1. This Action is in response to an Amendment filed on July 20, 2009. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 have been amended, Claim 13 has been newly added.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stecyk et al. (US 2002/0174270 A1), in view of Ben-Ze'ev (US 6,791,467 B1), and further in view of Kim (KR 2002011029).

**With respect to claim 1, Stecyk discloses:**

- devices that are connected to an electronic data link, wherein each device of the device (Figure 1 and [0043]) has a name memory for storing a

Art Unit: 2442

device name uniquely assigned to a device of the devices, to enable the each device to be uniquely actuated within the network (Figure 9B and [0090])

- a mobile input unit having an input device configured to allow input of a desired device name (Figure 4)
- wherein the mobile input unit is configured to select or change the device name stored in the name memory via the electronic data link (Figure 9B and [0090])

Stecyk does not disclose:

- wherein the electronic data link is configured for allowing communication between the mobile input unit and the device, and wherein the electronic data link has so short a range that, by positioning the mobile input unit in a vicinity of the device, the device is selected among the devices.

However, Ben-Ze'ev discloses:

- having an electronic data link for communication between the input unit and a device, which link has so short a range that, by positioning the input unit in the vicinity of a device, this device is selected among the devices on the network (Col. 11, lines 15-24 and Col. 14, lines 6-14, *where the remote controller detects an appliance in its vicinity and is able to*

Art Unit: 2442

*automatically program the appliance to be turned on by the remote controller)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk with the teachings of Ben-Ze'ev to be able to control an appliance that is in the vicinity of the remote controller, *because* it will allow devices that were not originally set up to the remote controller to also be controlled by the controller and indeed provide a universal transmitter to all devices in the home automation network.

Stecyk and Ben-Ze'ev do not explicitly teach wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name.

However, Kim discloses wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name (Description, *where user changes name of device and writes the name to HAVIUserPreferredName field*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk and Ben-

Art Unit: 2442

Ze'ev with the teachings of Kim to overwrite the device's name with its new name *because* it will allow the new device name to be changed in memory.

**With respect to claim 2**, Stecyk discloses wherein the devices have first transmission means of a first type for linking with other devices on the network (Figure 1 and [0043]) and second transmission means of a second type for communication with the mobile input unit (Figure 5)

**With respect to claim 3**, Stecyk discloses wherein the devices have transmission means of a first type for linking with other devices on the network (Figure 1 and [0043]), and the mobile input unit also has a transmission means of the first type, the device arrangement (Figure 4),

Stecyk does not disclose a means being provided to limit range so that communication between the input unit and a device is of a shorter range than communication between two devices.

However, Ben-Ze'ev discloses a means being provided to limit range so that communication between the input unit and a device is of a shorter range than communication between two devices (Col. 8, lines 51-58)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk with the teachings of Ben-Ze'ev to be able to control an appliance that is in the vicinity of the remote controller, *because* it will allow devices that were not originally set up to the

Art Unit: 2442

remote controller to also be controlled by the controller and indeed provide a universal transmitter to all devices in the home automation network.

**With respect to claim 4**, Stecyk discloses wherein the mobile input unit has a wireless transmission means and the devices have a corresponding wireless transmission means for communicating with the mobile input unit and for transmitting the name (Figure 4).

**With respect to claim 5**, Stecyk does not disclose wherein the range of communication between the input unit and a device is less than 3 meters.

However, Ben-Ze'ev discloses wherein the range of communication between the input unit and a device is less than 3 meters (Col. 8, lines 51-58)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk with the teachings of Ben-Ze'ev to be able to set the range to less than 3 meters, *because* it will allow for a shorter distance to be set so that the controller does not pick up every signal in its range.

**With respect to claim 6**, Stecyk does not disclose wherein the range of communication between the input unit and a device can be set by the user.

However, Ben-Ze'ev discloses wherein the range of communication between the input unit and a device can be set by the user (Col. 11, lines 15-24)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk with the

Art Unit: 2442

teachings of Ben-Ze'ev to be able to set the range, *because* it will allow for a shorter distance to be set so that the controller does not pick up every signal in its range.

**With respect to claim 7**, Stecyk does not disclose wherein the input unit has a display for displaying a device name read out from the device.

However, Ben-Ze'ev discloses wherein the input unit has a display for displaying a device name read out from the device (Abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk with the teachings of Ben-Ze'ev to provide a display for displaying a device name on the remote controller, *because* it will allow the user to view either the name of the device they choose to control or an icon representing the device to be controlled.

**With respect to claim 8**, Stecyk discloses wherein the input unit is suitable for input of a key for the device (Figure 4).

5. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stecyk et al. (US 2002/0174270 A1), in view of Kim (KR 2002011029).

**With respect to claim 9**, Stecyk discloses having a name memory that stores a device name uniquely assigned to the device, to enable the device to be uniquely actuated within the network (Figure 9B and [0090]), at least one wireless transmitter



Art Unit: 2442

(Figure 4), wherein the device name stored in the name memory is individually selected and/or changed via the wireless receiver (Figure 9B and [0090]).

Stecyk does not explicitly teach wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name.

However, Kim discloses wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name (Description, *where user changes name of device and writes the name to HAVIUserPreferredName field*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk and Ben-Ze'ev with the teachings of Kim to overwrite the device's name with its new name *because* it will allow the new device name to be changed in memory.

**With respect to claim 10**, Stecyk discloses having an input means for the input of a desired device name and a wireless transmission means for transmitting the device name (Figure 4).

Stecyk does not explicitly teach wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within

Art Unit: 2442

the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name.

However, Kim discloses wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name (Description, *where user changes name of device and writes the name to HAVIUserPreferredName field*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk and Ben-Ze'ev with the teachings of Kim to overwrite the device's name with its new name *because* it will allow the new device name to be changed in memory.

**With respect to claim 11**, Stecyk discloses a desired device name is entered with an input means belonging to a mobile input unit and the input unit is brought into the vicinity of a device, and the device name being entered is transmitted via an electronic data link from the mobile input unit to the device, the device name stored in the device being selected or changed as appropriate (Figure 9B and [0090]).

Stecyk does not explicitly teach wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input

Art Unit: 2442

unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name.

However, Kim discloses wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name (Description, *where user changes name of device and writes the name to HAVIUserPreferredName field*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Stecyk and Ben-Ze'ev with the teachings of Kim to overwrite the device's name with its new name *because* it will allow the new device name to be changed in memory.

**With respect to claim 12**, Stecyk discloses the plurality of devices on the network includes at least one of the following: a home network having a plurality of electronic devices, building control devices, home entertainment electronics devices, or network control devices (Figure 1 and [0043]).

**With respect to claim 13**, Stecyk discloses wherein the plurality of devices on the network includes at least one of the following: a home network having a plurality of electronic devices, building control devices, home entertainment electronics devices, or network control devices (Figure 1 and [0043]).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ESTHER BENOIT whose telephone number is (571)270-3807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday between 7:30 a.m and 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2442

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

E.B.

November 2, 2009

/Shawki S Ismail/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455